Message

From: Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]
Sent: 11/23/2020 9:58:31 PM
To: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]; Dunn, Alexandra [dunn.alexandra@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Fischer, David [Fischer.David@epa.gov]; Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]; Mills, Madeline [Mills.Madeline@epa.gov]; Bolen, Derrick [bolen.derrick@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: For Alex/Rick REVIEW: Globe PFAS Mosquito story; DDL: Today COB

The lab is continuing to analyze samples – even this week. But not something I would add to the language below.

Ed

Ed Messina, Esq.
Acting Office Director
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
p: (703) 347-0209

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 4:47 PM
To: Dunn, Alexandra <dunn.alexandra@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Cc: Fischer, David <Fischer.David@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Mills, Madeline <Mills.Madeline@epa.gov>; Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For Alex/Rick REVIEW: Globe PFAS Mosquito story; DDL: Today COB

To my understanding, nothing has happened until now where we got this data from the reporter. I'm not sure what else we can until we hear back from R1/Dennis after he connects with MassDEP.

From: Dunn, Alexandra <dunn.alexandra@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 3:24 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Cc: Fischer, David <Fischer.David@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Mills, Madeline <Mills.Madeline@epa.gov>; Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For Alex/Rick REVIEW: Globe PFAS Mosquito story; DDL: Today COB

Has any more progress been made? Given that this happened in August, our statement leaves me wanting a bit more.

Alexandra Dapolito Dunn, Esq.
Assistant Administrator
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
US Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 3:17 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Dunn, Alexandra <dunn.alexandra@epa.gov>
Cc: Fischer, David <Fischer.David@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Mills, Madeline <Mills.Madeline@epa.gov>; Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>
Subject: For Alex/Rick REVIEW: Globe PFAS Mosquito story; DDL: Today COB

Alex and Rick- The Boston Globe/Clark Mosquito has popped back up again with a reporter reaching out to both R1 and OPP with questions yesterday evening (see below). The reporter was supposed to have a call today with MassDep (and MassDep were going to report back to the R1 RA on how that went) but so far this call has not yet occurred. In the meantime, R1, OPA, and us refreshed our statement on this matter, which is pasted below for your approval. Let me know if you have any edits or concerns with the statement and we will also keep you all posted on this on-going matter. -Allison

From: Drinkard, Andrea
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 2:51 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; Deegan, Dave <Deegan.Dave@epa.gov>; Hewitt, James <Hewitt.James@epa.gov>; Deziel, Dennis <Deziel.Dennis@epa.gov>; Szaro, Deb <Szaro.Deb@epa.gov>; Gutro, Doug <Gutro.Doug@epa.gov>; McGuire, Karen <Mcguire.Karen@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>
Cc: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Hull, George <Hull.George@epa.gov>; Hoverman, Taylor <hoverman.taylor@epa.gov>; Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Norcross, Jeffrey <Norcross.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW: Globe PFAS story

Thanks, Allison. Cleaned up and slightly rearranged for flow. Does anyone have additional edits? Dave D, how are we doing on timing with the reporter? I'd like Taylor to weigh in as well, if she has time.

Statement

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Background

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Deegan, Dave <Deegan.Dave@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 7:33 AM
To: Deziel, Dennis <Deziel.Dennis@epa.gov>; Szaro, Deb <Szaro.Deb@epa.gov>; Gutro, Doug <Gutro.Doug@epa.gov>; Norcross, Jeffrey <Norcross.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; McGuire, Karen <Mcguire.Karen@epa.gov>
Cc: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Leifer, Kerry <Leifer.Kerry@epa.gov>; Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; Hull, George <Hull.George@epa.gov>; Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Globe PFAS story

Hi All, flagging for awareness Boston Globe inquiry below.

Assuming we will coordinate between HQ and region.

Dave

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Dave Deegan
US EPA, Region 1
Office of Public Affairs
deegan.dave@epa.gov
617.918.1017 office
617.594.7068 iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "Abel, David" <dabel@globe.com>
> **Date:** November 22, 2020 at 6:14:43 PM EST
> **To:** "Leifer, Kerry" <Leifer.Kerry@epa.gov>, "Deegan, Dave" <Deegan.Dave@epa.gov>
> **Subject: Globe PFAS story**
>
> Hi Kerry and Dave,
>
> I hope all's well. I'm working on a potential story about elevated levels of PFAS found in Anvil, the insecticide Massachusetts and other states use to spray for EEE. Below is a table of findings from DEP, as well as a press release and other documents from PEER, urging the state to ban the use of the chemicals.
>
> Just wondering if you could respond to these questions:
>
> -- Are these findings of PFAS in Anvil from the DEP concerning, and if so, why or why not?
>
> -- Should we be as concerned about forever chemicals (which don't degrade) being sprayed by air and truck entering drinking water and other water systems, and if so, why?
>
> -- Based on these findings, should the EPA or states ban the use of these chemicals, and if so, why or why not?
>
> Thanks!
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Best, David

Summary Table of PFAS Concentrations from MassDEP Anvil 10 + 10 Sampling:

Sample collection date	9/22	9/22	9/22	9/22	9/22	10/21	10/21	10/21	10/21	10/22
Sample type	55 gal. drum 1	55 gal. drum 2	CONTROL: sampling device rinse cntrl. for 55 gal. drum 1 and 2	2.5 gal. jug 1 (SAMPLE 3)	sampling device rinse cntrl. 2.5 gal. jug 1	55 gal. drum 1	55 gal. drum 2	55 gal. drum 3 and dupli-cate sample	Sampling device rinse cntrl. for 55 gal. drum 1 and 2	2.5 gal. jug 2 and Dupli-cate sample
PFAS Compound	Concentration in nanograms per liter (ng/L) or part per trillion (ppt)									
Perfluorobutanoic Acid (PFBA)	**692**	171	ND ND	52.8 J	ND	**716**	174	**230** 216	ND ND	59.2 J 62.9 J
Perfluoro-3-Methoxypropanoic Acid (PFMPA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluoropentanoic Acid (PFPeA)	296	76.6 J	0.370 J ND	35.2 J	ND	290	55.4 J	88.7 J 84.7 J	ND ND	41.5 J 41.2 J
Perfluorobutanesulfonic Acid (PFBS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluoro-4-Methoxybutanoic Acid (PFMBA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluoro(2-Ethoxyethane)Sulfonic Acid (PFEESA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Nonafluoro-3,6-Dioxaheptanoic Acid (NFDHA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
1H,1H,2H,2H-Perfluorohexanesulfonic Acid (4:2FTS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorohexanoic Acid (PFHxA)	132	41.2 J	0.407 J ND	17.6 J	0.461 J	105	23.7 J	37.4 J 42.3 J	ND ND	19.7 J ND
Perfluoropentanesulfonic Acid (PFPeS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
2,3,3,3-Tetrafluoro-2-[1,1,2,2,3,3,3-Heptafluoropropoxy]-Propanoic Acid (HFPO-DA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluoroheptanoic Acid (PFHpA)	53.4 J	23.6 J	ND ND	ND	ND	47.6 J	ND	ND 19.2 J	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorohexanesulfonic Acid (PFHxS)	**ND**	**ND**	**ND** **ND**	**52.8 J**	**ND**	**ND**	**ND**	**ND** **ND**	**ND** **ND**	**59.2 J** **57 J**
4,8-Dioxa-3h-Perfluorononanoic Acid (ADONA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
1H,1H,2H,2H-Perfluorooctanesulfonic Acid (6:2FTS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	29.8 J	31.6 J	27.6 J 28.9 J	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)	**25.7 J**	**ND**	**ND** **ND**	**ND**	**ND**	**21.8 J**	**ND**	**ND** **ND**	**ND** **ND**	**ND** **ND**
Perfluoroheptanesulfonic Acid (PFHpS)	107	100	ND ND	125	ND	ND	98.9	63.0 J 52.0 J	ND ND	138 108
Perfluorononanoic Acid (PFNA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorooctanesulfonic Acid (PFOS)	**73.1 J**	**ND**	**ND** **ND**	**76.2 J**	**2.73**	**ND**	**ND**	**ND** **ND**	**3.31** **ND**	**132** **141**
9-Chlorohexadecafluoro-3-Oxanone-1-Sulfonic Acid (9Cl-PF3ONS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
1H,1H,2H,2H-Perfluorodecanesulfonic Acid (8:2FTS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorodecanoic Acid (PFDA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluoroundecanoic Acid (PFUnA)	13.8 J	ND	ND ND	21.5 J	ND	184	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND

11-Chloroeicosafluoro-3-Oxaundecane-1-Sulfonic Acid (11Cl-PF3OUdS)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND
Perfluorododecanoic Acid (PFDoA)	ND	ND	ND ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND ND	ND ND	ND ND

Table notes: ND = not detected; J = estimated value; Tube rinse cntrl. = sampling device rinsates performed at sampling site prior to sample collection to assess any sampling device contamination. All field and trip blanks were generally non-detect and are not presented. In one, PFOS was detected at 3.3 ppt.

All samples were analyzed by Alpha Analytical, Mansfield, MA. using a modified version of EPA Method 533. Stated reporting limits for product samples were below 100 ng/L with detection limits ranging from approximately 5-50 ng/L depending on the analyte. QA/QC issues were appropriately noted by Alpha Analytical in the lab reports but all QA/QC elements have not been fully reviewed by MassDEP at this time.

The September and October samples were collected by two different contractors using new sampling devices. The October 2.5 gallon jug samples were directly poured into the sample collection tubes.

Initial samples that were collected on 9/2 are not presented. These were invalidated because appropriate field controls were not collected by the contractor and results were consistent with samples being contaminated during collection. In that round, five to thirteen PFAS were detected in duplicate analyses of the single drum 1 sample collected, with a maximum concentration of 25 ug/L (25,000 ppt) for PFBA.

David Abel
Reporter
The Boston Globe
dabel@globe.com
Follow on Twitter @davabel
See my bio here, films here, and recent stories here